SOME NEW BOOKS. Moriey's Life of Gladstone

With the possible exception of Mr. Bryce, no living Englishman is so well qualified as is Mr. JOHN MORLEY from the viewpoints of sympathy, of literary ability and of parliamentary and ministerial experiences, to produce the long expected biography, now published in three volumes, The Life of William Ewart Gladstone (Macmillans). No other biographer has had imposed upon him a task so exacting as regards the bulk of the documentary materials that have had to be examined. In the first place, all the papers collected at Hawarden were placed at Mr. Morley's disposal. Besides that vast accumulation, he has been supplied with several thousands of letters forthcoming from the legion of Mr. Gladstone's correspondents. He tells us that, on the whole, between two and three hundred thousand written papers of one sort or another have passed under his eye. The diaries from which he often quotes consist of forty little books in double columns, intended to do little more then record persons seen or books read, or letters written by the subject of the biography as the days passed by. As regards the spirit in which the work has been composed the author says that he has obeyed because it agreed with his own conception of his duty—the injunction laid upon him by Queen Victoria, that the narrative be not

handled in a narrow, partisan way. In an introduction, Mr. Morley shows himself keenly alive to the temerity of the attempt to write a life of Mr. Gladstone so soon after the statesman's death. He recognizes that the ashes of the controversies in which the subject of this work was so deeply concerned are still hot and that while the narrator stands so near the events, it is difficult to adjust perspective, scale, and relation. Moreover, not all the particulars, especially with regard to the later stages of Mr. Gladstone's public life, can be disclosed without risk of unjust pain to persons now alive. It is equally obvious that, to defer the task for thirty or forty years, would also, though on other grounds, be objectionable. Interest would grow less vivid; truth would become harder to discover; memories would pale and color would fade. If, in one sense, a statesman's contemporaries, even when death has abated the storm and temper of faction, can scarcely judge him, yet, in another sense, they who breathed the same air that he breathed, who knew at close quarters the problems that faced him, the materials with which he had to work and the limitations of his time, may be the best memorialists. This was an advantage that Thucydides had over

Another question had to be settled by

Tacitus.

Mr. Morley before he began his narrative What was to be the scope of his work? Should it be as nearly as possible, exclusively biographical, or should it present, in addition to the subject's life a history of his time? This is a question with which a biographer is not perplexed in the case of a man of letters. Where, on the other hand, the subject is a mar who was four times at the head of the British Government, and who held the office of Prime Minister for a longer time than any other statesman in the reign of Queen Victoria, it is plainly impracticable to tell the story of his works and days without continual and ample reference to the events over whose unrolling he presided. Mr. Morley does not profess to have overcome successfully the almost insuperable difficulty of fixing in a task like his the precise boundary which should be drawn between history and biography. He warm his readers that a detailed account of Mr. Gladstone's work as theologian and churchman will not be found in these pages. Some may think, consequently, that he has made the preponderance of politics excessive in the story of a man of signal versatility to whom politics was but one interest among many Touching this possible criticism, the biographer says: "No doubt, speeches, debates, bills, divisions, motions and manouvres of parties, like the manna that fed the Children of Israel in the wilderness, lose their savor and power of nutriment on the second day. Yet, after all, it was to his thoughts, his purposes, his ideals, his performances as a statesman, in all the widest significance of that lofty and honorable designation, that Mr. Gladstone owes the lasting substance of his fame." As he himself said, his life was ever "greatly absorbed in working the institutions of his country.

We have seen that Mr. Morley took to heart the Queen's suggestion that he write in no blind spirit of party. It does not follow that there is no trace of bias in this biography. All that is claimed for it is that there is no bias against the truth. Indifferent neutrality frigid insensibility in a work penned, as this is, in the spirit of loval and affectionate remembrance, would be distasteful, discordant and impossible, "I should be," says the biographer, "heartily sorry if there were no signs of partiality and no evidence of prepossession. On the other hand, there is, I trust, no importunate advocacy or tedious assentation. He was great man enough to stand in need of neither. Still less has it been needed, in order to exalt him, to disparage others with whom he came into strong collision His own funeral orations from time to time on some who were in one degree or another his antagonists proved that this petty and ungenerous method would have been to him of all men most repugnant. Admiration and sympathy, however, need not exclude discrimination. To pretend that for sixty years Mr. Gladstone "traversed in every zone the restless ocean of a great nation's shifting and complex politics without many a faulty tack and many a wrong reckoning would indeed be idle." We are reminded that no such claim is set up by rational men for Pym, Cromwell, Washington or either Pitt. It is not set up for any of the three contemporaries of Mr. Gladstone whose names are bound up with the three most momentous transactions of his age-Cayour, Lincoln and Bismarck. Neither has Mr. Morley acted on the assumption that, in all fields of inquiry or endeavor Mr. Gladstone's intellect showed itself equally powerful and fruitful. "To suppose," we read, "that in every one of the many subjects touched by him, besides exhibiting the range of his powers and the diversity of his interests, he made abiding contributions to thought and knowledge, is to ignore the jealous conditions under which such contributions came." Mr. Morley submits, however, that to say so much as this is to make but a small deduction from the total of a grand account.

We shall here pass rapidly over the first volume and that part of the second which precedes Mr. Gladstone's first accession to the Premiership, thus covering in the present notice the first thirty-five years of

With the possible exception of Lord Mansfield, Mr. Gladstone is the most conspicuous and powerful of all the public leaders in Great Britain's history who have sprung from the northern half of the island. Born at Liverpool on Dec. 29, 1809, he was the son of a Scotch merchant who had moved

Mr. Gladstone said: "I am not slow to claim the name of Scotsman, and, even if I were, there is the fact staring me in the face that not a drop of blood runs in my veins except what is derived from a Scottish By way of hitting his curious ancestry." duality of disposition, an opponent once described him as an ardent Italian in the custody of a Scotsman. Mr. Morley thinks that it is easy to make too much of race, but he adds: "When we are puzzled by Mr. Gladstone's seeming contrarieties of temperament, his union of impulse with caution, of passion with circumspection, of pride and fire with self-control, of Ossianic flight with a steady foothold on the solid earth, we may, perhaps, find a sort of explanation in thinking of him as a

Highlander in the custody of a Lowlander. To understand Gladstone it is important to bear in mind not only that he was a Scotsman, but also that he was brought up in a household of strong Tory predilection. "I was bred," said Mr. Gladstone, when risen to meridian splendor, "under the shadow of the great name of Canning; every influence connected with that name governed the politics of my childhood and the removal of religious disabilities and in the character which he gave to our policy abroad; with Canning I rejoiced in the opening which he made toward the establishment of free commercial interchanges between nations; with Canning, and under the shadow of the vet more venerable name of Burke, my youthful mind and imagination were impressed." By the authority of the same names, Mr. Gladstone might have consoled himself for the fact that when a young member of the House of Commons he had opposed the emancipation of slaves in the British colonies. It is certain that on slavery and even the slave trade Burke had argued against total abolition. Canning in 1823 laid down the principle that amelioration of the lot of the negro slave was the utmost limit of action, and that his freedom, as a result of amelioration, was the object of a pious hope, and no more. Canning described the negro as a being with the form of a man and the intellect of a child. He goes on to use words that express the convictions of many Americans who have marked the results of the indiscriminate bestowal of the franchise on the negro by the framers of our Reconstruction legislation. "To turn nim loose," said Canning, "in the manhood of his physical strength, in the maturity of his physical passions, but in the infancy of his uninstructed reason, would be to raise up a creature resembling the splendid fiction of a recent romance (Frankenstein), the hero of which constructs a human form with all the corporal capabilities of a man, but being unable to impart to the work of his hands a perception of right and wrong, he finds too late that he has only created a more than mortal power of doing mischief.

Like Canning, Gladstone was sent Eton. He entered the school in his twelfth year and left it at the age of eighteen. His attachment for Eton grew with the lapse of vears-to him it was ever "the queen of all schools." "When I was at Eton." he said long afterward, "we knew very little indeed but we knew it accurately." In mathematics he did not go far, but his subsequent career at the university shows tha e must have been well grounded in algebra and geometry as well as in the classics Probably, as his biographer suggests, it was ess by school work, or spoken addresses in invenile debate, or by early attempts in the difficult art of written composition, than by blithe and congenial comradeship, that at Eton the mind of the young Gladstone was stimulated, opened and strengthened.

Again, like Canning, Gladstone proceeded

from Eton to Christ Church College, Oxford.

which at that time was at the top of its

academic fame. Christ Church was then almost as conspicuous in the class lists as Balliol College was to be afterward. For a year and a half the young man took his llage course pretty easily but in 1920 his really hard work began, and, ultimately like Sir Robert Peel, he took a "double first," that is to say, a first class in classics and also in mathematics. He twice com peted unsuccessfully for the Ireland scholarship, conferred for especial proficiency in Greek, and tried, but failed, to secure the Newdigate prize for a poem. It is well known that he was active in the debates in the Union Debating Society, and in May, 1831, made a speech there against Parliamentary reform that struck all his hearers with amazement, so powerful and splendid did it seem in their vouthful eves Two generations after he had quitted the university, Mr. Gladstone summed up her influence upon him in the following words: "Oxford had rather tended to hide from me the great fact that liberty is a great and precious gift of God, and that human excellence cannot grow up in a nation without it. Yet I do not hesitate to say that Oxford even at this time had laid the foundations of my liberalism; school pursuits had revealed little; but in the region of philosophy she had initiated, if not inured me to the pursuit of truth as an end of study. * * * I declare that, while in the arms of Oxford, I was possessed through and through with a single-minded and passionate love of truth, with a virgin love of truth, so that, although I might be swathed in clouds of prejudice, there was something of an eye within that migh gradually pierce them."

11. It was the memorable anti-reform speech at the Oxford Union that caused the Duke of Newcastle to inform Gladstone, then not 23 years old, that his influence in the borough of Newark was at the young man's disposal, should be desire to enter Parliamentary life. The Duke also offered a handsome contribution toward expenses, yet asked for no pledges from his protége After a brief correspondence with his father. Gladstone issued an address to the electors of Newark in August, 1832, and, after a hot contest, was returned in December of that year. It appears that his election expenses exceeded £2,000. He never forgot his disgust at what he deemed the improper use of money on this occasion, and of all the measures that he was destined in later days to place upon the statute book, none was more salutary than the law levelled at corrupt practices at elections. He took his seat at the opening of the Reformed House of Commons in 1833, and almost simultaneously entered at Lincoln's Inn, where be dined in hall pretty frequently down to 1839. He kept thirteen terms, but

Mr. Gladstone first opened his lips in Parliament on April 30, 1833, when a petition from Newark was presented, and on June 3 he spoke at considerable length against the Government's proposals for the gradual abolition of colonial slavery. The speech was uncommonly successful. The bill had been introduced by Stanley, afterward Lord Derby, the "Rupert of debate," who said of the young man who had attacked him, "I never listened to any speech with greater pleasure." King William IV. also wrote to Althorp that he "rejoiced to hear that a young member had come forward in so promising a manner as Viscount Althorp states Mr. W. E. Gladstone to have done." It is, of course, well understood

was never called to the bar.

eighteenth century. When he had grown to as a Tory of the Tories. In 1833, not only be the most famous man in the British realm | did he oppose the abolition of slavery, but he voted for the worst clauses of the Irish Coercion bill of that year, and fought against the admission of Jews to Parliament. He also resisted the admission of Dissenters to the Universities, which he described as seminaries for the Established Church. He supported the existing corn laws. He opposed a motion for the abolition of military and naval sinecures and another motion for the abolition of flogging in the army, except for mutiny and drunkenness. He voted against the ballot, a reform that was to be carried by his own

Government forty years later. Gladstone was not quite 25 years old when, in December, 1834, Sir Robert Peel, having been invited to form a Government made him one of the Lords of the Treasury. This appointment was noted at the time as an innovation upon a semi-sacred social usage. Sir Robert Inglis said to him You are about the youngest lord who was ever placed at the Treasury on his own account, and not because he was his father's son." Within about a month he was promoted to be Under-Secretary for the Colonies, Lord Aberdeen being at the head of the Colonial Office. Mr. Gladstone's first of my youth; with Canning I rejoiced in glimpse of official power and responsibility was but momentary, for in April, 1835, Sir Robert Peel resigned. Of his Parliamentary career during the following six years two incidents deserve commemora tion. In 1837 Sir William Molesworth had been invited to come forward as candidate for Leeds. A report spread that Sir William was not a believer in the Christian articles of faith. Somebody wrote to Molesworth to know if this were true. He answered that the question whether he was a believer in the Christian religion was one that no man of liberal principles should propose to another, or could propose with out being guilty of a dereliction of duty Touching this incident Mr. Gladstone said that he would ask: "Is it not a time for serious reflection among moderate and candid men of all parties, when such a question was actually thought impertinent interference? Surely they would say with him that men who have no belief in the divine revelation are not the men to govern this nation, be they Whigs or Radicals." The biographer's comment on the young man's exhibition of intolerance is: "Long, extraordinary, and not inglorious, was the ascent from such a position as this to the principles so nobly vindicated in the speech on the Affirmation bill in 1883."

In the Ministry formed by Sir Robert Peel in August, 1841, Mr. Gladstone was invited to take the post of Vice-President of the Reard of Trade. About two and a half years previously he had brought out the book on "Church and State," which caused Macaulay to describe him in the Edinburgh Review as the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories. Lockhart said of him that, though a hazy writer, Gladstone had shown himself a considerable divine, and it was a pity that he had entered Parliament, instead of taking orders. Sir Robert Peel asked impatiently why any body with so fine a career before him should go out of his way to write books. The work made no converts in theory, and was pretty promptly cast aside in practice. The fourth edition fell flat.

In after years Mr. Gladstone said of his qualifications for the office of Vice-President of the Board of Trade: "I was totally ignorant, both of political economy and of the commerce of the country. I might have said, as I believe was said by a former holder of the vice-presidency, that my mind was, in regard to all those matters, sheet of white paper,' except that it was doubtless colored by a traditional prejudice in favor of protection, which had then quite recently become a distinctive mark of conservatism." Gladstone's assumption of the post, however, was followed by hard, steady and honest work, and as he himself said afterward, "every day so spent beat like a battering ram on the unsure fabric of my official protectionism. By the end of the year I was far gone in th opposite sense.

It was largely upon Mr. Gladstone that he burden of framing and passing the tariff of 1942 fell-he spoke 129 times during the session-and it was evident that his admission to the Cabinet could not be long deferred. In the spring of the following year he was promoted from the vice-presi lency to the presidency of the Board of Trade, and a seat in the Cabinet was given him. He was not yet 34 years old, and had been only a little more than a decade in Parliamentary life. Canning was 37 pefore he gained the same eminence, and had been thirteen years in the House. It well known that in February, 1845, Mr. Gladstone resigned from the Peel Cabinet because he did not approve of the Premier's plan to increase the grant of public money to the Maynooth Seminary for the training of Catholic priests.

The popular verdict on his resignation was that the act was a piece of political prudery. A journalistic wag observed that "a lady's footman jumped off the Great Western train, going forty miles an hour, merely to pick up his hat. Pretty much like this act, so dispreportional to the occasion, is Mr. Gladstone's leap out of the Ministry to follow his book"; because the principles advocated in "Church and State" were irreconcilable with the proposed grant to Maynooth Seminary. In December, 1845, however, Mr. Gladstone reentered the Peel Cabinet as Secretary for the Colonies. Of course, the acceptance of office vacated his seat at Newark, and Mr. Gladstone declined to offer himself again as a candidate for that borough having alienated the Duke of Newcastle by his desertion-the Duke called it betraval-of the Protectionist cause. After trying in vain to get a seat elsewhere, Mr Gladstone remained from December, 1845 until the resignation of the Peel Govern ment in July, 1846, a Minister of the Crown without a seat in Parliament. In our own day such a state of things would be looked upon as a public inconvenience and a political anomaly too glaring to be tolerated We scarcely need point out that Mr. Glad stone, not being at the time a member of the House of Commons, took no part in

the historic debates on the repeal of the Corn laws in 1848. It will be remembered that, after the Corn laws had been repealed, Sir Robert Peel was beaten on an Irish coercion bil by what Wellington called a "blackguard combination" between the Whigs and the Protectionists. He resigned, and Lord John Russell, at the head of the Whigs came in. Mr. Gladstone was without a seat in Parliament until the dissolution in June, 1847, when he was returned for the University of Oxford, and continued to represent that constituency for eighteen years. It is curious to find him in 1847 supported by Dr. Pusey on the one hand. and by Arthur Stanley and Jowett on the other. The men of the old school, who looked on Oxford as the ancient and pecul iar inheritance of the Church, were zealous for him: the new school, who deemed the university an organ, not of the Church but of the nation, eagerly took him for their champion.

The first of Mr. Morley's three volume is divided into four books. In the third across the border in the latter part of the that young Gladstone entered Parliament, chapter of the third book, he discusses

the complications which followed the fall of Peel and the break-up of the Tory party in July, 1846. When Lord John Russel was forming his Government, he saw Pee and proposed to include several members the latter's party. Peel thought such a junction under existing circumstances unadvisable, but said he should have no ground of complaint if Lord John made offers to any of his friends; and he should not attempt to influence them either way. The action ended in a proposal of office to Dalhousie, Lincoln and Sidney Herbert. Nothing came of it, and the Whigs were left to go on as best they could upon the narrow base of their own party. The Protectionists, however, gave them to under stand that, before Lord George Bentinck Disraeli and their friends had made up their minds to turn Peel out, they had decided that it would not be fair to put the Whigs in merely to punish the betrayer and then to turn round upon them. On the contrary, fair and candid support was, they said, what they intended. it came to pass that, whereas Sir Robert Peel's Conservative Government had car ried Liberal measures, Lord John Russell's Liberal Government now subsisted on

Conservative declarations The Peelites, according to a memoran dum of Mr. Gladstone's, from a number approaching 130 in the Corn laws crisi of 1846 were reduced at once by the general election of 1847 to less than half. The resultant number, added to the Liberal force, gave free trade a large majority; added to the Protectionists, it would have just turned the balance in their favor. So long as Sir Robert Peel lived-he died July 2. 1850-the entire body of Peelites never voted with the Protectionists. From the first however, a division arose among Peel's adherents that widened as time went on and led to a long series of doubts, perplexities and manœuvres that lasted down to 1859, and constitute a pivotal chapter in Mr Gladstone's political story. Many of those who had stood by Peel's side in the day of battle, and who still stood by him on the morrow, when victorious policy was conjoined with personal defeat, were in more or less latent sympathy with the several Protectionists in everything except protect tion. Among these were such men as Lord Stanhope, Lord Harding, Gen. Peel, Mr. Corry and Mr. Wilson Patten, most of whom in days to come, took their places in Conservative Administrations. Others, again, of the Peclites, Mr. Gladstone has himself recorded, "whose opinions were more akin to those of the Liberals cherished, nevertheless, personal sympathies and lingering wishes, which made them tardy perhaps unduly tardy, in drawing toward that party I think that this descripiton applied in some degree to Mr. Sidney Herbert, and in the same, or a greater degree, to myself." The first Tory Government formed after

the death of Sir Robert Peel, the Govern ment formed by Lord Derby and Disraeli in 1852, was short lived, Mr. Gladstone, with some thirty other Peelites, cooperating in its defeat. It was succeeded by a coalition Government, to the support of which the Whigs and Radicals contributed 270 votes in the House of Commons, the so-called Irish brigade 30 and the Peelites about 30 Notwithstanding the insignificance of their voting strength, the Peelites were repre sented in the Cabinet by the Premier, Lord Aberdeen; by Mr. Gladstone, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by four other Ministers. Of the important offices out of the Cabinet, the thirty Peelites got more than did the 270 Whigs and Radicals. It is well known that this Cabinet was wrecked, owing to the popular dissatisfaction at the conduct of the Crimean War. Mr. Gladstone, however, added signally to his reputation by the far-reaching and comprehensive character of the carliest of his thirteen budgets. The simplification of the tariff, begun by Peel eleven years before was carried forward almost to completion nearly 140 duties being extinguished, and nearly 150 being lowered. It is interesting that, at the end of seven years, Parliament would be able to dispense with the income tax He remained for more than twenty vears opposed to the retention of the income tax as a portion of the permanent and ordinary revenue of the country.

The Aberdeen Ministry was beaten or Jan. 29, 1855, by the overwhelming vote of 325 to 146. The Queen sent for Lord Derby, who would have undertaken to form a Gov ernment could be have secured the suppor of Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone are Sidney Herbert. An extract from his diary shows that Mr. Gladstone was at this time inclined to rejoin the Conservatives, and would have done so had Palmerston and Herbert consented to enter the proposed Cabinet, and had a seat also been offered to Sir James Graham. "To a Derby Government," wrote Gladstone many years later, "now that the party had been drubbed out of protection, I did not in principle object; for old ties were with me more operatively strong than new opinions. The negotiations came to nothing, however, because Lord Palmerston declined to cooperate with the Tories, and Lord Derby made no separate offer to the Peelites. Not only Gladstone, but Disraeli, thought that at this crisis Lord Derby missed a promising opportunity of reconsolidating the Tory party, and of gaining the support of the country. Lord Derby having failed to form a Government, the Queen sent for Lord Lansdowne who would have undertaken to discharge the commission if Mr. Gladstone had agreed to retain the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Mr. Gladstone refused, and ever afterward regretted the refusal.

In an autobiographic note of 1897 he recalls: "I said [to Lord Lansdowne] that the working of the coalition [between Peelites and Whigs since its formation in December, 1852, had been to me entirely satisfactory, but I was not prepared to cooperate in its continuation under any other head than Lord Aberdeen. I think that, though perfectly satisfied to be in a Peelite Government which had Whigs or Radicals in it, I was not ready to be in a Whig Government which had Peelites in it. It took a long time, with my slow moving and tenacious character, for the Ethiopian to change his skin." The opinion expressed to Mr. Gladstone by Lord Aberdeen at the time was: "certainly the most natural thing under the circumstances, if it could have been brought about in a satisfactory form, would have been that we should have joined Derby." We scarcely need mention that the outcome of the crisis of 1855 was the advent of a Cabinet headed by Lord Palmerston, in which at first Mr Gladstone kept his former place of Chancellor of the Exchequer, but from which he, Herbert and Graham quickly resigned when they found that the Premier intended to sanction the proposed inquiry into the conduct of the Crimean War. Of the Peelite group, only the Duke of Argyll and Canning remained in the Ministry. Mr. Gladstone overrated the importance of the secession of the Peelites. He gave the Palmerston Cabinet a twelvementh of life at most. As it turned out, Palmerston was, with one brief interruption, installed for a decade.

Mr. Gladstone now occupied for a time a position of political isolation. On the one hand he had refused to return to his

old comrades, the Conservatives, although these had practically ceased to be protectionists, but on the other hand he had declined to east his lot irrevocably with the Whigs. In the spring of 1856 Lord Derby repeated the overtures to him that had been made in 1851 and 1855. Mr. Gla 4stone consulted with his Peelite friends, Lord Aberdeen, Graham, Herbert and Cardwell. Graham went straight to the point. He observed that the question of vital consequence was. Who should lead the House of Commons? A Tory Government, he thought, should delegate that function to Gladstone and not to Disraeli. In a memorandum of the conference made or April 17, 1856, Mr. Gladstone recorded: I had said, and repeated, that I thought we could not bargain Disraeli out of the saddle; that it must rest with him (so far as we [the Peelites] were concerned) to hold the lead if he pleased; that, besides my looking to it with doubt and dread, I felt he had this right, and that I took it as one of the data in the case before us, in which we might have to consider the question of political junction, and which might be seriously affected by it." Of hese approaches in the spring of 1856 noth-

In 1857 Mr. Gladstone sided with the Conservatives on two important occasions He attacked the budget presented by Cornewall Lewis, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Palmerston Government, and he supported Cobden's motion to censure the Palmeraton Government for forcing a war on the Chinese. The motion of censure was carried, but the outcome of the ensuing appeal to the constituencies was a triumph for Palmerston. Mr. Gladstone's leaning toward the Conservative party now seemed o become more decided rather than less He could see nothing but evil in Palmerston's supremacy. He fought furiously the divorce bill introduced by the Palmerston Government in the summer of 1857 and managed to secure some modifications of the measure. In February, 1858, he cooperated with Bright and Milner Gibson in heir successful attack on the Conspiracy to Murder bill (prompted by Orsini's attempt to assassinate Napoleon III.), that overthrew Lord Palmerston. Lord Derby, who was now called upon to form his second administration, made one more attempt to bring Mr. Gladstone back into the Conervative ranks. The decision taken by him in response to this overture, and to second application made three months later, marks one of the turning points in Gladstone's career. Mr. Morley thinks that Mr. Gladstone was influenced to a ertain extent in his rejection of the Conervative leader's proposal by a letter from John Bright, who pointed out that "if you join Lord Derby, you link your fortunes with a constant minority and with a party in the country which is every day lessening in numbers and in power. If you remain on our side of the House you are with the majority, and no Government can be formed without you." At this time Mr Gladstone's political friends were uneasy about him. He was approaching fifty and it locked as if he were destined to fall between two stools. In the spring of 1858, even friendly journalists wrote of him as the most signal example that the present time affords of the man of speculation misplaced and lost in the labyrinth of practical politics." They called him the chief orator and the weakest man in the House of Commons. In organs supposed to be inspired by Disraeli the fate of Mr. Gladstone was predicted with equal precision. In phrases hat sound as if they had dropped from Disraeli's lips the public was told that cerebral natures, men of mere intellect without moral passion, are quite unsuited

for governing mankind." Another Tory writer called him "A Simeon Stylites among the statesmen of his time Nevertheless, when in May, 1858, Lord Ellenborough resigned the presidency of the Board of Control in the Tory Cabinet, Lord Derby pressed Mr. Gladstone to take that ould be prefer it, the Colonia office After consulting Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham Mr. Gladstone declined the offer, in spite of a letter from Mr. Disraeli (here reprinted) which reflects much credit on its writer, and which assured Mr. Gladstone that, whatever office he might consent to fill in a Tory Cabinet, his "shining qualities would always render him supreme." In October, 1858, Mr. Gladstone ecepted from Bulwer Lytton, Secretary for he Colonies in Lord Derby's Cabinet, the appointment of commissioner for the Ionian Island. This although the Peelite friends whose advice he sought were, with one exception, more or less unconditionally adverse to his acceptance of the commissionership. The immediate outcome of the observations made by him at first hand was that it would be nothing less than a crime against the safety of Europe if England were to surrender the protectorate over he Ionian Islands. That was what he said in 1859. In 1862, however, he changed his mind and declared that "without a good head for Greece, I should not like to see the Ionian protectorate surrendered; with it, I should be well pleased, for one, to be responsible for giving it up." It will be remembered that in 1863 Lord Palmerston. who in 1850 had said that it would be great folly to surrender Corfu, handed all the Ionian islanders over to their kinsfolk if kinsfolk they truly were, upon the Greek main-

IV. In the division of June 11, 1859, which resulted in the defeat of the Derby Government, Mr. Gladstone voted with the Conservatives. Nevertheless, in the Cabinet formed a few days later by Lord Palmerston, he accepted the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. The appointment and the acceptance of it occasioned a good deal of remark. The advanced Liberals were disgusted: They said: "This man has done all he could on behalf of Lord Derby. Why is he here to keep out one of us?" Even wondered how he could bring himself to join a minister of whom he had for three or four years used such unsparing language as had been common on his lips about Lord Palmerston. The man in the street was puzzled by a vote in favor of keeping a Tory Government in, followed by a junction with the men who had thrown that Government out. The explanation of his course which Mr. Gladstone gave in 1864 ran as follows: "When I took my present office in 1859 I had several negative and several positive reasons for accepting it. Of the first, there were these

"There had been differences and collisions, but there were no resentments. I felt my self to be in an isolated position, outside the regular party organizations of Parliament. And I was aware of no differences of opinion or tendency likely to disturb the new Government. Then, on the positive side, I felt sure that in finance there was much useful work to be done. I was desirous of cooperating in settling the question of the franchise, and failed to anticipate the disaster that it was to undergo. My friends were enlisted, or I knew would enlist: Sir James Graham, indeed, declining office, but taking his position party. And the overwhelming in the interest and weight of the Italian question, and of our foreign policy in connection with it, joined to my entire distrust of the former

Government in relation to it, led me to deide without one moment's hesitation

The acceptance of office under Lord Palmerston is commonly regarded as a chief landmark in Gladstone's protracted ourney from Toryism to Liberalism. Mr. Morley does not deny the enormous significance of the party wrench, but he holds that it was not a conversion. Palmerston was so much of a Derbyite Tory that his Government owed its long spell of power to the countenance of Derby and his men. To join the Palmerston Administration, therefore, marked for the new Chancellor of the Exchequer a party severance but no change of principles. His present biographer would say that at this time Mr. Gladstone was in his politics a Liberal reformer of Turgot's type, a born lover of good government, of just, practical laws, of wise improvement, of public business well handled, of a State that should emancipate and serve the individual. On the other hand, the necessity of summoning a new driving force and amending the machinery of the Constitution had not yet disclosed itself to him. Meanwhile, he may well have thought that he saw as good a chance of doing as important work with Palmerston as with Disraeli; indeed, a far better chance, for the election just concluded had shown that a Derby Government could exist only on suffer

Mr. Gladstone remained Chancellor of the Exchequer from 1869 until the Liberal Government resigned in June, 1866. He was not the leader of the party in the House of Commons, however, until after Lord Palmerston's death in October, 1865. Up to that time, of course, Palmerston was the leader, and his first lieutenant was Sir George Grey. When Earl Russell suceeded Palmerston as head of the Liberal Administration he requested Mr. Gladstone to lead the Ministerial forces in the lower house, and then it was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer came to be definitely recognized by British Liberals as their rising star. He could not save his party from defeat, however, in June, 1866, for certain features of its Reform bill gave offence to a section of the Liberals, the so called Adullamites, who, headed by Robert Lowe, seceded from their party and helped the Tories to overthrow Ear Russell's Government. It was Mr. Gladstone who, as leader of the Opposition, confronted Mr. Disraeli during the next two eventful years, and it was he who in June, 1868, after Mr. Disraeli, through Lord Derby's resignation, had become Prime Minister, forced him to dissolve Parliament by carrying a resolution to the effect that the Anglican Church in Ireland should cease to exist as an "establishment." At the ensuing general election, in November, 1868, the Liberals gained a tremendous victory, and on Dec. 1 Mr. Gladstone was invited to form a Cabinet. With his acession to his first Premiership the first thirty-five years of his public life came to an end. The greatest work of his career belongs to the next quarter of a century. during half of which period he was to be Prime Minister. The memorable events which belong to that culminating epoch of his life must be reserved for notice on another occasion. It will be convenient at this point to pause and mark Mr. Gladstone's relation to the Italian Revolution and to the American civil war

We find no record in this biography of

any fervent expression of sympathy on Mr.

Gladstone's part with the revolutionists of 1848 in France, Germany, Hungary and Italy. It is true that in July, 1851, he pubished some memorable letters denouncing the iniquitous treatment of political oflenders by the Neapolitan Government. Not then, however, nor for some years to come, did Mr. Gladstone grasp the idea of Italian unity. "You need not be afraid, I think," he told Lord Aberdeen on Dec. 1, 1851, "of Mazzinism from me, still less of Kossuthism, which means the other plus imposture, Lord Palmerston and his nationalities." In 1859, however, Mr. Gladstone stood forth as a convinced and enthusiastic advocate of the doctrine of nationalities On no statesman of his time did that doc trine gain a more commanding hold. Throughout the series of transactions that followed the peace of Villafranca, transactions that transformed the Kingdom of Sardinia into the Kingdom of Italy, Mr. Gladstone's sympathies never wavered. As early as April 18, 1859, while Europe was anxiously watching the prospects of war between France and Austria, Mr. Gladstone declared in Parliament his firm conviction that no plan of peace could be durable which failed to effect some mitigation of the sore evils afflicting the Italian peninsula. He was exasperated at the unexpected preliminaries of Villafranca. "I little thought," he wrote in July, 1859, "to have lived to see the day when the conclusion of a peace should in my own mind cause disgust rather than impart relief. But that day has come. I appreciate all the difficulties of the position, both of the King of Sardinia and of Count Cavour. It is hardly possible for me to pass a judgment upon his (Cavour's) resignation as a political step; but I think few will doubt that the moral character of the act is high. The duties of England in respect to the Italian question are limited by her powers, and these are greatly confined. But her sentiments cannot change, because they are founded upon a regard to the deepest among those principles which regulate the inter-

John Russell. It will be remembered that Sicily and he Neapolitan mainland had just been liberated by Garibaldi. Lord John Russell said in his despatch: "The Governments of the Pope and the King of the two Sicilies had provided so ill for the welfare of their people that their subjects looked some of Mr. Gladstone's private friends to their overthrow as a necessity preliminary to any improvement. * * the people of Naples and the Roman States take up arms against their Government for good reasons? Upon this grave matter her Majesty's Government hold that the people in question are themselves the best judges of their own affairs. Her Majesty's Government do not feel justified in declaring that the people of southern Italy had not good reasons for throwing off their allegiance to their former Government Her Majesty's Government, therefore, could not pretend to blame the King of Sardinia for assisting them." The words may seem pale and colorless as we read them now, but they spread in Italy like flame. Copies of a translation of them were passed from hand to hand. People wept over them for joy and gratitude.

course of men and their formation into

political societies." He heartily concurred

in the views set forth in the famous de-

spatch penned on Oct. 27, 1860, by Lord

When Garibaldi visited London in the spring of 1864 he dined with Mr. Gladstone. and they met elsewhere. The biographer says that Mr. Gladstone once described the Italian chief to him as "one of the finest combinations of profound and unalterable simplicity with self-consciousness and self-possession. I shall never forget an occasion at Chiswick: Palmerston, John Russell and all the leaders were awaiting him on the perron; he advanced with perfect simplicity and naturalness, yet with perfect consciousness of his position; very striking and very fine." Some twenty beauts during the contest.

years after the Italian patriot's visit to London Mr. Gladstone said: "We who then saw Garibaldi for the first time can many of us never forget the marvellous effect produced upon all minds by the simple nobility of his demeanor, by his manners and his acts. Besides his splendid integrity and his wide and universal sympathies, besides that seductive simplicity of manner which never departed from him, and that inborn and native grace which seemed to attend all his actions, I would almost select from every other quality this, which was in apparent contrast but real harmony in Garibaldi-the union of the most profound and tender humanity with his fiery valor."

On the whole, it was in 1862 that Mr Gladstone must be held to have made his greatest speech on Italian affairs am ashamed to say," he told the House, "that, for a long time I, like many, withheld my assent and approval from Italian yearnings." He proceeded to atone amply for his tardiness. His exposure of Naples, where perjury had been the tradition of its kings; of the government of the Pope in the Romagna, where the common administration of law and justice had been handed over to Austrian soldiery; of the stupid and execrable lawlessness of the Duke of Modena; of the attitude of Austria as a dominant and conquering nation over a subject and conquered raceall this stamped a decisive impression on the minds of his hearers. Mr. Morley thinks that, along with his speech on reform in 1864, and that on the Irish Church in the spring of 1865, it secured Mr. Gladstone's hold upon all of the rising generation of Liberals who cared for the influence and the good name of Great Britain in Europe and who were capable of sympathizing with popular feeling and the claims of national justice.

VI.

It seems strange to us now that an English statesman who in 1859 could respond so quickly and so fervently to the appealt of the Italians, should have been unable in 1861-65 to find in his heart any sympathy for the cause of the Union, during our civil war. It is well known that or Oct. 7, 1862, at a banquet in the Town Hall of Newcastle, Mr. Gladstone, being then Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Palmerston Government, let fall a sentence about the American civil war of which he was destined never to hear the last: "We know quite well that the people of the Northern States have not yet drunk of the cunthey are still trying to hold it far from their lips-which all the rest of the world see they nevertheless must drink of. We may have our own opinions about slavery; we may be for or against the South; but there is no doubt that Jefferson Davis and other leaders of the South have made an army: they are making, it appears, a navy; and they have made, what is more than eitherthey have made a nation." The sensation which these words produced was, naturally, immediate and profound. All the world took so pointed an utterance to mean that the British Government were about to recognize the independence of the South. Mr. Charles Francis Adams, then our Minister in London, wrote on the following day in his diary: "If Gladstone be any exponent at all of the views of the Cabinet, then is my term likely to be very short. The animus, as it respects Mr

There is no doubt that Mr. Gladstone went further than the Premier, Lord Palmerston, or the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Lord John Russell, had authorized him to go. Lord John Russell wrote: "You must allow me to say that I think you went beyond the latitude which all speakers must e allowed when you said that Jeff Davis had made a nation. Recognition would seem to follow, and for that sten I think the Cabinet is not prepared." A week after the deliverance at Newcastle, Sir G. Cornewall Lewis, apparently at Lord Palmerston's request, put things rig in a speech at Hereford. The Souther States, he said, had not de facto established their independence and were not entitled to recognition on any accepted principles of public law. From other data, which Mr. Morley very properly considers it his duty to set forth, it is evident that as late as November of the year just named, Mr Gladstone personally desired an interposition on the part of England, France and Russia between the South and the North. About two years before his death Mr.

Gladstone himself put on record in a frag-

mentary note his own estimate of an error

that, in view of his official position, might

have had lamentable consequences.

Davis and the recognition of the rebel

cause, is very apparent.

have yet to record," he wrote in July, 1896. "an undoubted error, the most singular and palpable-I may add, the least excusable of them all, especially since it was committed so late as the year 1862, when I had outlived half a century. In the autumn of that year, and in a speech delivered after a public dinner at Newcastlaon-Tyne, I declared in the heat of the American struggle that Jefferson Davis had made a nation; that is to say, that the division of the American Republic by the establishment of a Southern or Secession State was an accomplished fact." Gladstone went on to admit that, not was this a misjudgment of the case, b even if it had been otherwise, he was the person to make the declaration. "That my opinion was founded upon a false estimate of the facts was the very least part of my fault. I did not perceive the gross impropriety of such an utterance from Cabinet Minister of a Power allied in b. and language and bound to loyal trality; the case being further exaggera by the fact that we were already, speak, under indictment before the or not (as was alleged) having enforced the laws of neutrality in the My offence was of the cruisers. only a mistake, but one of incredib ness, and with such consequences and alarm attached to it that my perceive them justly exposed med severe blame." There is no doubt the Gladstone's compunction was since it is equally certain that the America forgave him. It was made known long before his death by proofs able and indisputable that in no of the world, not even in Italy. the Balkan peninsula, was his t in higher honor than it was in ! States.

Left-Handed Vituperative

From the London Dudy.
One of the gravest objections. to be left handed is the certain nick named from its peculiarity ne early years of life. Most col eft handedness, and they are nfortunate left handed child's n the term is kack handed, the equivalent to awkward; in Lancash in Yorkshire, gallock or gawk hardeston dating back to at least the sev tury. In Derbyshire are used handed, cork handed, or corky hand the Teesdale district cuddy handed and in Nottinghamshire, wallet handthe South of England special ter left handedness are also found scrame handed, and in Devonshire ed in Scotland we find gawk handed, an awry handed: In freland a lef alled a kithogue. Not many pear cally used this word in a speech at n which he said that Mr is left hand, and had already give